

art rejection in the August 8, 2007 Official Action is identical to the grounds for prior art rejection in the prior Official Action dated February 6, 2007.

At page 3, last paragraph of the latest Official Action, the Examiner contends that "...Cole provides means 45a, 45b for resiliently biasing the receptacle unit into said extended position. Elements 45a, 45b are springs. When the receptacle unit 10 is manually pulled upward, means 45a, 45b resiliently bias the receptacle unit into said extended position...".

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion. As the Examiner concedes, it is necessary to manually pull the receptacle unit 10 upwardly into its extended position. Therefore, elements 45a and 45b do not resiliently bias the unit into its extended upward position. If they did so, it would be unnecessary to manually pull the unit into its upwardly extended position.

Contrary to the Examiner's conclusion with regard to elements 45a, 45b, Applicant respectfully refers to pages 4 - 7 of the Amendment filed on May 7, 2007, discussing elements 45a, 45b. These elements are stops which maintain the receptacle unit 10 in its extended upward position after the receptacle has been manually lifted into its extended upward position. Elements 45a, 45b are therefore stops for maintaining the receptacle unit 10 in its upward extended position after it has been manually lifted

- 2 -

into that position, and are not means for resiliently biasing the receptacle unit into its extended upward position.

At page 3, last paragraph of the latest Official Action, the Examiner also contends that elements 27, 37 are "able to be released", and refers to Fig. 5 of the drawing. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion. There is nothing in Fig. 5 of the drawing which shows that elements 27, 37 are "cooperating releasable locking means for opposing said means for resiliently biasing for retaining said receptacle unit in said retracted position", as expressly disclosed and claimed by Applicant. On the contrary, elements 27, 37 of the Cole patent are flanges which cooperate with the stops 45a and 45b to retain the housing in its extended position after the housing has been manually lifted from the casing into its upward extending position. However, elements 27, 37 of the Cole device do not provide releasable locking means to maintain the housing in the casing, opposing a resilient bias, as disclosed and claimed by Applicant. On the contrary, elements 27, 37 of the Cole device are provided for a totally different function - namely, to retain the housing in its extended upward position relative to the casing after the housing has been manually lifted from the casing, and not to oppose the resilient force on the housing urging it into its extended position, as expressly disclosed and claimed by Applicant. See pages 6 - 8 of the Amendment filed by Applicant on May 7, 2007 which discusses elements 27, 37 of the Cole patent.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 6, 19 and 20 in the Final Action dated August 8, 2007, and submits that this application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark P. Stone
Reg. No. 27,954
Attorney for Applicant
25 Third Street, 4th Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-3355